



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/405,210	09/24/1999	BRUCE D. MARCHANT	18865-32US	9239

20350 7590 12/20/2001

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

VU, DAVID

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2818

DATE MAILED: 12/20/2001

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/405,210		Applicant(s) MARCHANT ET AL.	
	Examiner DAVID VU		Art Unit 2818	
	<p align="center">-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --</p> <p>Period for Reply</p> <p>A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). <p>Status</p> <p>1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 October 2001</u>.</p> <p>2a) <input type="checkbox"/> This action is FINAL. 2b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> This action is non-final.</p> <p>3) <input type="checkbox"/> Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i>, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.</p> <p>Disposition of Claims</p> <p>4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-17</u> is/are pending in the application.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.</p> <p>5) <input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.</p> <p>6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-17</u> is/are rejected.</p> <p>7) <input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.</p> <p>8) <input type="checkbox"/> Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.</p> <p>Application Papers</p> <p>9) <input type="checkbox"/> The specification is objected to by the Examiner.</p> <p>10) <input type="checkbox"/> The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.</p> <p>11) <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) <input type="checkbox"/> approved b) <input type="checkbox"/> disapproved.</p> <p>12) <input type="checkbox"/> The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.</p> <p>Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119</p> <p>13) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a) <input type="checkbox"/> All b) <input type="checkbox"/> Some * c) <input type="checkbox"/> None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been:</p> <p style="padding-left: 80px;">1. <input type="checkbox"/> received.</p> <p style="padding-left: 80px;">2. <input type="checkbox"/> received in Application No. (Series Code / Serial Number) _____.</p> <p style="padding-left: 80px;">3. <input type="checkbox"/> received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</p> <p>14) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. & 119(e).</p> <p>Attachment(s)</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div style="width: 45%;"> <p>15) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</p> <p>16) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</p> <p>17) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>11</u>.</p> </div> <div style="width: 45%;"> <p>18) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____</p> <p>19) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)</p> <p>20) <input type="checkbox"/> Other:</p> </div> </div>			

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

1. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Huang (US 6,037,628).

Huang, in related text (Col. 2, Lines. 1-51 and Col. 3, Lines. 4-7) and figures (Fig. 1-9), discloses a process for manufacturing a trench field effect transistor comprising the steps of:

etching a first trench 20/22 in a N-type substrate ;

lining the first trench 20/22 with a layer of dielectric material 24;

substantially filling the trench 20/22 with conductive material 26 to form a gate electrode of the field effect transistor;

implanting impurities of a second conductivity type (P-type) into the substrate 10 to form a body region 14 having the second conductivity type (P-type) over the substrate 10;

implanting impurities of the first conductivity type (N-type) inside the body region 14 to form a source region 16 adjacent to the first trench 20/22;

etching a second trench 34 through the source region 16 and into the body region 14;

and filling the second trench²⁴ with conductive material 36 for making contact with both the source region 16 and the body region¹⁴.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 10 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang (US 6,037,628).

Huang (US 6,037,628), discloses all claimed subject matter, but omits the second trench is approximately as deep as the first trench.

However, the implanting energy, dosage, thickness, depth are considered to involve routine optimization which has been held to be within the level of ordinary skill in the art. As noted in *In re Aller*, the selection of reaction parameters such as energy, dosage, thickness, width and temperature, etc. would have been obvious: "Normally, it is to be expected that a change in energy, concentration, thickness, dosage, temperature, or combination of any of them would be an unpatentable modification. Under some circumstances, however, changes such as these may impart patentability to a process if the particular ranges claimed produce a new and unexpected

result which is different in kind and not merely degree from the results of the prior art ... such ranges are termed "critical ranges and the applicant has the burden of proving such criticality.... More particularly, where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." In re Aller 105 USPQ233, 255 (CCPA 1955). See also In re Waite 77 USPQ 586 (CCPA 1948); In re Scherl 70 USPQ 204 (CCPA 1946); In re Irmischer 66 USPQ 314 (CCPA 1945); In re Norman 66 VSPQ 3 08 (CCPA 1945); In re Swenson 56 USPQ 3 72 (CCPA 1942); In re Sola 25 USPQ 433 (CCPA 1935); In re Dreyfus 24 USPQ 52 (CCPA 1934). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the requisite art at the time the invention was made would have used any energy, concentration, thickness, depth range suitable to the method in process of Huang, in order to improve the performance of the semiconductor device.


Conclusion

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Vu whose telephone number is (703) 305-0391. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00am to 5:00pm.

If attempt to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Nelms., can be reached on (703) 308-4910.

David Vu DV

Art Unit 2818


David Nelms
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800